UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,477	09/15/2003	Peter Dam Nielsen	879A.0141.U1(US)	2898
29683 HARRINGTON	7590 03/08/201 N & SMITH	EXAMINER		
4 RESEARCH	DRIVE, Suite 202	RADTKE, MARK A		
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2165	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/08/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/663,477	NIELSEN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	MARK A. X RADTKE	2165					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 16 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	i, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(TINOT KELET WAS TI					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount on thortened statutory period for reply original than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL	"		6.11				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuous continuous canceling a continuous	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		npliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owabie ii submilled in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	4 h - 5	41	h				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea vand was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail: e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	try is below or attach	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Neveen Abel-Jalil/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165							

Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach "wherein the camera control software application provides for taking a picture and then assigning the picture from a camera menu instead of from a phonebook menu." The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, Applicant argues that the "Gallery" menu of the LG reference is separate and distinct form the "Camera" menu. This is incorrect. The Gallery is a submenu of the Camera menu. See step 1 on page 51, where the first step in accessing the Gallery is to "select Camera". Thus, the Gallery is a submenu of the Camera, so anything done (e.g. invoked) by the Gallery is also done by the Camera.

Applicant argues that the LG reference "fails to provide technical details of the kinds of applications" on the phone, and therefore the reference is deficient. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The claimed invention is generally directed to user interface improvements in cell phones. User manuals provide a description of the technical capabilities of a phone from a user interface perspective. It is not necessary to teach implementation details of the cell phones to teach the claimed matter. Similarly, Applicant's disclosure does not describe the gate-level implementation of cell phone CPUs to describe user-level applications.

Applicant argues that the "level of skill" required to operate the LG cell phone is "vastly different" than the instant invention. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

There is no known case law or MPEP section dealing with "level of skill" arguments related to patentability. If Applicant is putting forth a novel theory of patentability, then Applicant may be best served by appealing the case. The Examiner would hesitate to be persuaded by novel legal theories absent explicit guidance from the BPAI, or at least some case law or MPEP guidance to support Applicant's position.

Applicant argues that the in re Venner analysis fails because the Camera and Gallery applications are allegedly separate. The Examiner respectfully disagrees for the reasons given above.